

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 01749 310154Z

62

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 IO-14 ISO-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03

NEA-10 NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03 USIA-15

TRSE-00 SAJ-01 ACDA-19 SS-20 NSC-07 EB-11 DRC-01 /153 W

----- 030898

R 302330Z MAR 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 4914

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 3832

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

USMISSION EC BRUSSELS

AMEMBASSY VIENNA

USMISSION GENEVA

AMEMBASSY DUBLIN

S E C R E T USNATO 1749

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PFOR, NATO

SUBJECT: ASSESSMENT OF THE ALLIANCE: FIRST QUARTER, 1974

VIENNA FOR USDEL MBFR

GENEVA FOR USDEL CSCE

SUMMARY: THE PUBLIC STRAINS BETWEEN THE US AND THE NINE IN THE FIRST THREE MONTHS OF 1974 TURNED ON THE CENTRAL IMPORTANT AND INDEED HISTORIC QUESTION: WHAT WILL BE THE FUTURE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE US AND AN EMERGING EUROPE, IF ANY? DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE US AND FRANCE SHARPENED, WITH THE US ADVOCATING PARTNERSHIP, COOPERATION AND CONSULTATION AND WITH FRANCE ARGUING FOR IDENTITY, DIFFERENTIATION, AND FLEXIBILITY. SOME OTHERS STRADDLED THE GULF IN BETWEEN, AVOIDING ANY FATEFUL CHOICE BETWEEN EITHER AN "ATLANTIC" EUROPE OR A "FRENCH" EUROPE. WHAT WILL ULTIMATELY DETERMINE THE COURSE OF THIS SHARP DEBATE IS THE WAY IN WHICH THE US DECIDES TO RESPOND TO AN INCREASINGLY EXPLICIT AND DEFIANT FRENCH FOREIGN POLICY PROGRAM, AND, THUS, WHETHER THE US OR FRANCE IS SUCCESSFUL IN PERSUADING THE OTHERS OF THE MERITS OF ITS CASE. ANSWERS TO THIS SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 01749 310154Z

QUESTION MAY ALSO SHED LIGHT ON THE QUESTIONS OF WHETHER A "POLITICAL EUROPE" HAS A FUTURE AND, IF SO, WHAT ITS RELATIONSHIP WILL

BE TO "ECONOMIC EUROPE," AND TO ANY FUTURE EUROPEAN SECURITY

ARRANGEMENTS. END SUMMARY.

THE QUARTER

1. THE SIMMERING DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE US AND THE NINE, WHICH BROKE INTO HEADLINES IN THE OPENING MONTHS OF 1974, HAD BEEN SLOWLY GAINING MOMENTUM IN RECENT YEARS. EVENTS THIS YEAR, HOWEVER, BROUGHT OUT CLEARLY THAT THE ISSUE UNDERLYING THESE INDIVIDUAL CONTROVERSIES WAS THE FUNDAMENTAL QUESTION OF THE FUTURE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE US AND WHAT IS DESCRIBED AS AN EMERGING EUROPE.

2. THROUGH A SERIES OF MAJOR ACTIONS, THE US MADE ABUNDANTLY CLEAR ITS CONCEPT OF THIS FUTURE RELATIONSHIP. AT THE DECEMBER MINISTERIAL MEETING, THE SECRETARY DECLARED THE US "WILLING--INDEED EAGER-- TO DEDICATE OURSELVES TO A NEW ERA OF COOPERATION AND CONSULTATION," AND HE ADDED ON MARCH 21 THAT THE US CONTINUED TO ENCOURAGE OTHER CENTERS OF DECISION. THE WASHINGTON ENERGY CONFERENCE EPITOMIZED THE US APPROACH TO FINDING COOPERATIVE SOLUTIONS TO COMMON PROBLEMS. THE SECRETARY'S PERSONAL BRIEFING OF THE MARCH 4 COUNCIL ON HIS EFFORTS TO ACHIEVE A MIDDLE EAST SETTLEMENT AND THE MARCH 14 REINFORCED MEETING OF THE NAC, CONVENED IN RESPONSE TO A PROPOSAL BY THE SECRETARY AT THE DECEMBER MINISTERIAL, CONFIRMED WASHINGTON'S STRENGTHENED COMMITMENT TO CONSULTATIONS. THE CANCELLATION OF PRESIDENT NIXON'S PROSPECTIVE SPRING VISIT TO EUROPE AND THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENTS FROM CHICAGO AND HOUSTON VIVIDLY EXPRESSED THE US EXPECTATION THAT CONSULTATION SHOULD BE A TWO-WAY STREET AND UNDERLINED THE FACT THAT THE US CAN NOT VIEW ITS SECURITY COMMITMENT IN ISOLATION FROM THE BEHAVIOR OF THE NINE ON POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC FRONTS.

3. AT THE SAME TIME, FRENCH OFFICIALS REINFORCED THEIR OPPOSITE CONCEPT. IN REFUSING TO SIGN THE WASHINGTON ENERGY CONFERENCE COMMUNIQUE, JOBERT MADE CLEAR THE FRENCH VIEW THAT US APPEALS FOR "COOPERATION" ONLY CAMOUFLAGED A US EFFORT TO REASSERT ITS POLITICAL LEADERSHIP OVER WESTERN EUROPE. WHILE FRANCE REACTED MILDLY TO THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENTS IN CHICAGO, THERE IS NO DOUBT THAT PARIS CONTINUED TO CONTEND THAT LUMPING OF ECONOMIC, SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 01749 310154Z

POLITICAL AND SECURITY ISSUES IS BLACKMAIL. FRANCE WAS CLEARLY DETERMINED TO ENSURE THAT THERE WOULD BE NO "EUROPE" UNLESS IT WERE A EUROPE ON FRENCH TERMS, I.E., A "EUROPE DES PATRIES" CO-EQUAL, EXCEPT IN SECURITY TERMS, WITH THE US AND USSR, ACTING WITH FULL INDEPENDENCE AS AN ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL BLOC, WITH PARIS AT ITS CENTER.

4. IN CONTRAST TO THE CLARITY OF FRENCH OBJECTIVES, THE OTHER ALLIES FOUND THEMSELVES UNABLE TO RECONCILE THE FULL RANGE OF THEIR NATIONAL INTERESTS WITH EITHER THE US CONCEPT OR THE FRENCH CONCEPT OF EUROPE'S FUTURE RELATIONSHIP TO THE US. UNDER THE FORCE OF THE US ARGUMENT FOR COOPERATION, THEY ABANDONED ELEMENTS OF A COMMON EC-9 POSITION AT THE WASHINGTON ENERGY CONFERENCE. BACK ON THE

CONTINENT, THEY SIGNED AN EC-ARAB DECLARATION APPARENTLY WITHOUT ADEQUATE CONSULTATION WITH THE US AND DID SO AT THE MOMENT WHEN SECRETARY KISSINGER WAS IN BRUSSELS CONSULTING PERSONALLY IN THE NAC ON THE MIDDLE EAST. AGAIN REMINDED OF THE FRAGILITY OF THEIR GOVERNMENTS, (NEW ELECTIONS IN UK, SPD ELECTION LOSSES, FALL OF FOURTH RUMOR GOVERNMENT AND BELGIAN GOVERNMENT), THE OTHER ALLIES SEEMED MORE INCAPABLE THAN EVER OF PROVIDING THE LEADERSHIP TOWARD A COMMON VISION OF A NEW ATLANTIC RELATIONSHIP.

#### PROSPECTS

5. IN VIEW OF THE HIGH STAKES INVOLVED, PUBLIC AND OFFICIAL DEBATE OVER THE FUTURE PATTERN OF US-EUROPEAN RELATIONS WILL PROBABLY CONTINUE WITH SOME INTENSITY IN THE COMING MONTHS AND WILL PERMEATE DISCUSSION OF MOST MAJOR ISSUES IN THE ALLIANCE.

6. THE FRG, THE UK AND OTHERS WILL NOT FIND IT IN THEIR INTEREST FEEL IT NECESSARY TO MAKE A CLEAR CHOICE BETWEEN AN "ATLANTIC" EUROPE AND A "FRENCH" EUROPE. THE FRG WILL PROBABLY ATTEMPT TO PLACATE WASHINGTON, AS IT IS ALREADY DOING IN ITS IDEAS FOR A NEW US-EC CONSULTATIVE MECHANISM, WHILE, FOR WANT OF A BETTER GOAL FOR THE FUTURE, TRYING TO SALVAGE THE EUROPEAN INTEGRATION MOVEMENT ON ANY BASIS. THE NEW BRITISH GOVERNMENT, HOWEVER, APPEARS MUCH LESS COMMITTED TO THE EUROPEAN IDEAL, MAY DRIVE HARD BARGAINS WITH ITS EC PARTNERS ON A SUBJECT-BY-SUBJECT BASIS. ALL OUR ALLIES WILL, IN ANY CASE, TRY TO TONE DOWN PUBLIC DEBATE AND ENSURE THAT IF THERE IS A DIRECT CONFRONTATION BETWEEN THE US AND EUROPE, THE US WILL FOCUS ITS  
SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 01749 310154Z

ATTACK DIRECTLY ON FRANCE.

7. FRANCE WILL LIKELY CONTINUE ITS EFFORT TO ATTACH AN EC LABEL, BOTH IN PRINCIPLE AND IN SPECIFIC ACTIONS TO ITS CONCEPT OF EUROPE. FRANCE IS OVEREXTENDED, HOWEVER, AND IN THE FACE OF A TOUGHER UK BARGAINING POSITION WILL PROBABLY GO THROUGH A PERIOD OF CAREFUL TESTING LONDON'S ATTITUDES. WITH LITTLE COMMITMENT ON THE PART OF EITHER THE UK OR FRANCE TO AN AMALGAMATED EUROPE (WHICH MICHEL DEBRE RECENTLY CHARACTERIZED AS "VAIN" AND "DANGEROUS"), THE FRAGILE PROCESS OF EC-9 POLITICAL CONSULTATIONS COULD BE FURTHER DRAINED OF SUBSTANCE.

#### US INVOLVEMENT

8. FOR THE US, THE DEBATE OVER THE FUTURE US RELATIONSHIP WITH THE NINE MAY WELL PROCEED IN TWO TRACKS.

9. THE FIRST WILL BE ON DE JURE GROUNDS, IF WORK ON ONE OR BOTH DECLARATIONS PROCEEDS. IF FRANCE BECOMES INTRANSIGENT IN ITS OPPOSITION TO US VIEWS ON THESE DOCUMENTS, IT MAY BE ULTIMATELY UP TO THE US TO DECIDE WHETHER TO TRY TO COMPOSE DIFFERENCES BILATERALLY WITH FRANCE, TO CONTINUE ADDRESSING ITS COMPLAINTS TO THE NINE COLLECTIVELY, OR TO ATTEMPT TO ISOLATE FRANCE. NEITHER WISHES TO BE

ISOLATED, BUT ONE WILL BE, UNLESS IT BENDS. THE SECOND WILL BE ON DE FACTO GROUNDS, AS ALLIED CONSULTATIONS INTENSIFY ON MAJOR ISSUES WHICH MAY INCREASINGLY REQUIRE URGENT ATTENTION, E.G. JACKSON-NUNN REQUIREMENTS, DEFENSE RATIONALIZATION, EUROPEAN AND NUCLEAR ISSUES IN MBFR, AND CSCE FOLLOW-ON. SOME ALLIES MAY, IN FACT, WISH TO GIVE INCREASING ATTENTION TO THE MORE "PRAGMATIC," ISSUE-BY-ISSUE APPROACH TO US-EUROPEAN RELATIONS. THE WASHINGTON ENERGY CONFERENCE WAS AN EXAMPLE OF THIS TYPE OF APPROACH. THE RECENT US-FRG OFFSET AGREEMENT WAS ANOTHER.

10. WORK ON SUCH MAJOR ISSUES MAY PLACE FRANCE ON WEAK GROUNDS, AS IT WAS AT THE ENERGY CONFERENCE, OF ARGUING AGAINST THE OBVIOUS SUBSTANTIVE REQUIREMENTS OF COOPERATION. FOCUS ON SPECIFIC SECURITY AND POLITICAL ISSUES WILL ALSO PROVIDE FURTHER INDICATIONS AS TO WHETHER THE EUROPE OF THE NINE CAN FURTHER DEVELOP ITS PRESENT DIFFERENTIATION BETWEEN POLITICAL CONSULTATIONS AND ECONOMIC COOPERATION AMONG THE NINE.  
RUMSFELD

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 11 JUN 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 30 MAR 1974  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** golinofr  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1974ATO01749  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1974/newtext/t19740381/abbryubl.tel  
**Line Count:** 182  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 4  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** golinofr  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 25 MAR 2002  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <25 MAR 2002 by kelleyw0>; APPROVED <06 MAY 2002 by golinofr>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** ASSESSMENT OF THE ALLIANCE: FIRST QUARTER, 1974  
**TAGS:** PFOR, NATO  
**To:** STATE INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS  
MOSCOW  
EC BRUSSELS  
VIENNA  
GENEVA  
DUBLIN  
**Type:** TE

**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005